

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
3
4 BRADLEY MARSHALL,) Case No. CV-11-5319 SC
5 Plaintiff,)
6 v.) ORDER RE: MOTION FOR
7 WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,) CLARIFICATION
8 et al.,)
9 Defendants.)
10)
11)

11 On May 23, 2012, the Court granted Defendants' motions for
12 judgment on the pleadings and entered a pre-filing order,
13 requiring, among other things, that Plaintiff file a motion for
14 leave prior to "fil[ing] any future claims in this District against
15 any Defendant in this action" ECF No. 79 ("Order") at 28.
16 On the same day, the Court entered judgment in favor of Defendants
17 and against Plaintiff. ECF No. 81. Plaintiff has since filed a
18 motion for clarification to determine whether he needs to obtain
19 the Court's permission before seeking review of the Court's Order
20 with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. ECF No. 82. He does not.
21 The pre-filing order is expressly limited to "any future claims" he
22 might file. It does not encompass appeals.

23
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25
26 Dated: May 24, 2012


27
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE